



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WATERS AND WATERCOURSES — NATURAL WATERCOURSES: OBSTRUCTION, POLLUTION, AND DIVERSION — EMBANKMENT TO PREVENT FLOODING.—The plaintiff and defendants owned land on opposite sides of a New Zealand river which frequently overflowed. To protect themselves, the defendants constructed an embankment some distance from the river bank. As a result, additional water was thrown on the plaintiff's land. The plaintiff brought an action for damages and an injunction. *Held*, that the suit be dismissed. *Gerrard v. Crowe*, 37 T. L. R. 110 (Privy Council).

A riparian proprietor cannot erect an embankment which will cause injury to opposite land in times of ordinary floods. *Burke v. Sanitary District*, 152 Ill. 125, 38 N. E. 670; *Menzies v. Breadalbane*, 3 Bli. N. S. 414. But an embankment is justified if it will cause damage only during extraordinary overflows. *Kansas City, M. & B. R. R. Co. v. Smith*, 72 Miss. 677, 17 So. 78; *Nield v. London & Northwestern Ry. Co.*, 10 Exch. 4. Analogous to this qualification is the rule that anyone is justified, although harming others, in protecting himself from the sea, the "common enemy." *The King v. Commissioners of Sewers*, 8 Barn. & Cres. 355. By a combination and extension of the two doctrines it has now been held permissible to build a levee along a river which ordinarily overflows with such violence as to be on principle more nearly like the sea. *Cubbins v. Mississippi River Commission*, 241 U. S. 351. It is true that the common-law idea of "common enemy" was expressly negatived by its originator as to rivers. See *The King v. Trafford*, 1 Barn. & Ad. 874, 888. But European authorities recognize its extension to other waters. See 11 DEMOLOMBE, CODE NAPOLÉON, No. 30. And the common-law doctrine, originating in England, is often inapplicable in other continents. See *Lamb v. Reclamation District*, 73 Cal. 125, 131, 14 Pac. 625, 628. This is true of New Zealand, whose rivers are wild and turbulent. See 19 ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANICA, 11 ed., 624. The case is interesting as an illustration of the elasticity of common-law doctrines in extending themselves to new situations.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE BRITISH YEAR BOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW. London: Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton. 1920. pp. vi, 292.

The announcement of a new periodical on international law is gratifying to persons interested in the subject at any time, but it is particularly welcome at this time to have appearing the first number of a British periodical. With the large number of English leaders in international law, and with the growth of the international law journals on the continent and in American countries — new reviews have appeared within the past eighteen months in Argentina and Mexico — it is a bit curious that no attempt in the same direction has previously been made in England, aside from the International Law Notes which is not exclusively devoted to international law. This first number gives promise that the new annual will contribute very notably to the "wider knowledge and comprehension of the subject," which its editors deem essential at this time.

The editorial committee, consisting of Sir Erle Richards, Prof. A. Pearce Higgins, Sir John Macdonell, Sir Cecil Hurst and E. A. Whittuck, Esq., is in itself a guarantee of the success of the undertaking, and the editor, Cyril M. Picciotto, Esq., has admirably handled the first number. The assertion that "much that was regarded as definitely established must be re-examined in the light of modern developments" is an indication of the spirit in which the plan